



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE SCHOOL REVIEW

A JOURNAL OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

VOLUME IX  
NUMBER 10

---

DECEMBER, 1901

---

WHOLE  
NUMBER 90

## THE NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND PREPARATORY SCHOOLS

THE sixteenth annual meeting of the association was held in the Boston Latin School, Warren avenue, on Friday and Saturday, October 11 and 12, 1901, with Mr. Edward G. Coy, of the Hotchkiss School, in the chair.

### FRIDAY AFTERNOON

At the opening of the first session, the records of the third special meeting, on May 25, 1901, were read and approved.

A letter was read from Dr. C. F. P. Bancroft, conveying a message of salutation to the members of the association, which was written but four days before his death. On motion, the secretary was requested to prepare a minute referring to the decease of Dr. Bancroft, to be offered on the following morning.

The Chair presented Hon. Frank A. Hill, chairman of the committee on Admission Examinations by a Joint Examining Board, which had reported in print at the May meeting, and to which the report had again been committed.

DR. HILL.—*Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:* In behalf of the committee on Admission Examinations by a Joint Examining Board, I herewith present its report. It is the same report that was laid before the association May 25. In offering this report I wish to read the following statement, which has the approval of our committee:

The Committee on Admission Examinations by a Joint Examining Board submitted its report to the association at a special meeting held at Boston University, May 25, 1901. It was voted by the association that the report be recommitted to the committee and that copies of it be sent to the presidents of the New England colleges, with a statement that it would be a subject for discussion at the October meeting. Members of the association were invited meanwhile to forward comments and suggestions to the chairman of the committee. No comments and suggestions, however, have come to him in consequence of this invitation. The committee has held one meeting since May 25.

While there are minor matters relative to which the report might be revised if rewritten, the committee sees no reason for changing its recommendations. The members of the association have had access to the report for several months and presumably are acquainted with its contents. It is enough to say that the committee, after reviewing various objections, real or imaginary, to a central examining board, adheres to its conviction that such a board would render the colleges and the preparatory schools a service so definite and valuable that no pains should be spared to secure its establishment.

As to the second and third recommendations of the committee, it should be said that the report outlines two plans which the committee has studied. These two plans, having certain minor qualifications, follow the general lines of the Middle States and Maryland plan, until they come to the reading and marking of the examination papers. This important function the first plan, like that of the Middle States and Maryland, assigns to the central board; the second plan retains it, for the present at least, for the colleges themselves. The committee, however, affirms the desirability of the central board's ultimately reading the papers.

The alternative plans presented by the committee are alike, then, with the single exception that the first entrusts the reading function at once to the central board, while the second would keep the question of its transference to that board an open one for further consideration.

In other respects both plans of the committee follow the plan of the Middle States and Maryland, except as to the following four points stated in the committee's report:

1. The definition of the entrance requirements.
2. The representation of the secondary schools in the framing of the questions.
3. The fixing of a pass mark.
4. The consultation of readers in doubtful cases.

The fourth point of difference — that relating to the consultation of readers — probably does not exist. Your committee has learned since making its report that the Middle States' plan provides for such consultation in doubtful cases.

Only three points of difference, therefore, remain. As to the first point of difference—that relating to the definition of entrance requirements—the Middle States' plan entrusts it to the central board; your committee would have the central board formulate the college definitions and adjust its questions to them. For a large proportion of the subjects, however, the outcome in the way of definition would be the same under either view; and as to the remaining subjects the trend would naturally be towards uniform definition.

As to the second point of difference—that relating to the representation of the secondary schools in the framing of the questions—the Middle States' plan recognizes such representation; your committee believes that such representation is inexpedient.

As to the third point of difference—the fixing of a pass mark by the central board below which no college shall accept a paper—the committee would have such a mark fixed by the central board in case it has the reading of the papers; the Middle States' plan permits a college to accept a paper however low its rating, notwithstanding the fact that that plan says that marks from sixty down to forty are "poor" or "very poor" and that marks below forty indicate failure.

While the committee adheres to its recommendations and urges the association to adopt them, it also believes that should the colleges organize an examining board in accordance with such recommendations, it would be well for them to do so with the understanding that points of difference between the plan of such a board and that of the Middle States' and Maryland would be proper subjects for mutual consideration and adjustment.

In conclusion, the committee reaffirms its advocacy of a New England examining board, its conviction of the importance of safeguarding certain gains that have been made in the admission standards and policies of the colleges, and its belief that the wisest course, on the whole, for the association to pursue is to adopt the recommendations of the committee's report.

DR. JOHN TETLOW.—Will Dr. Hill have the kindness to read again what he has read to us about the first point of difference?

DR. HILL.—The plan of the Middle States and Maryland places the definition of the entrance requirements under the control of the central board. Colleges do not define the admission requirements; the central board does that. Our suggestion is, at least for the present, that the central board shall limit itself to formulating the definitions of the colleges themselves and to adjusting the examination papers to those definitions. We think, however, that for a large proportion of the subjects the outcome in the way of definition would be the same whichever view is adopted, whether the view of the Middle States or of the report.

PROFESSOR JOHN K. LORD, of Dartmouth College.—*Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:* I did not understand that I was to open the discussion, because the secretary wrote to me, from the executive committee, asking me if I would consider the bearing of this report on the colleges that admit by certificate, and inasmuch as that question is fully and freely answered in the report itself, it seemed to me that I should have very little to say. I was very much surprised then to receive the program and to find that I was to open the discussion, because the certificate colleges of which I am a representative practically have nothing to do with this question at all.

This report is singularly full in its statement on that point, as on others, and it distinctly says that it has no bearing on the certificate colleges. The only point which it proceeds to make is that the certificate colleges may be induced by the opportunity to give up the certificate and accept the examination certificate. As far as I know, the certificate colleges are not open for a bid on that subject, they are not waiting for an opportunity to give up the certificate. I do not mean to say that all the members of the faculties of the colleges that admit on certificate view the certificate with favor, or if it were left to them, would continue the practice of a certificate, but I do not understand that the certificate colleges, as a whole or individually, are waiting for an opportunity to give up the certificate system. I would say on that point, however, for the college that I represent, that at the beginning of this year a resolution was introduced into the faculty by the president, asking the appointment of a committee to consider the subject of entrance to college both by examination and by certificate, to make a most careful examination of that subject in its bearing upon the college itself, upon the schools represented in fitting for the college, upon the relation of the college to those schools, and of the effect upon the young men themselves. That, of course, is a very broad subject. The committee was asked, if possible, to report within a year; if not possible, the report, of course, will be delayed. We are prepared at Dartmouth, I may simply say, to face the question squarely of an examination or of a certificate, without reference to any

other college. If that committee makes a report which meets the acceptance of the faculty, and that report establishes in the minds of the committee and of the faculty that it is desirable to have an examination in place of a certificate system for us, we shall adopt it; but I do not think that this proposition that is before this association, of an examining board, as far as I understand the situation, will enter into the consideration of that problem at all.

Though, Mr. President, it does not fall within my province, as I understand it, to discuss this question, yet as I am on my feet and may open the door for others I should like to say one or two words in reference to this report. The report seems to me to be a singularly full one. I think I scarcely ever read a report on so broad a subject that touched so fairly and so fully upon the different phases of the question; and the judgment which we shall pass, I imagine, upon the subject as a whole will not be from the lack of arguments presented on either side but from the weight that we shall give to the different points made. There are one or two things, however, in connection with it, that seem to strike me somewhat adversely. If I were a representative of an examining college, I am inclined to think I should look very favorably upon the proposition. It has so many elements of strength in it that certainly to put it away would require a very decided reason. And yet there are certain things about it that one thinks of as adverse to it.

The first is that, whatever may be the work of this examining board, it practically substitutes a system for a direct communication with either the school or the pupil. A year ago at our meeting, in the address given by President Hadley, great stress was laid upon the old fashioned examination which brought the examiner in direct association with the pupil, and upon the knowledge which he thus gained of the quality of the individual as distinguished from his appearance on a paper in examination. He, of course, recognized the fact that conditions had changed, and that it is not now possible for examinations to be conducted as they were, as he said, in his own time. But this system absolutely does away with all that personal contact between the

examiner and the examined, as far as I can see, and to that extent it is an injury.

For, in the second place, the great difficulty with college examinations, as far as I am acquainted with them, lies not in the fact that some candidates are accepted fully and as having met all the requirements, or that others are rejected because they are not sufficiently prepared, but in the other fact that there are so many that come prepared in part, who enter the certificate colleges with exceptions, who enter the colleges that give examinations on condition. Those two things mean the same thing, that boys or girls come to college and have not done all the work, or, if they have done it all, have not done it in such a way as to justify the examiners in giving them full credit for it. And yet those very cases, which, I venture to say, every college finds, contain a very large number of those who are well qualified to do the work of the college. A boy or a girl has not had a full opportunity to prepare himself or herself, and yet he or she makes upon the examiner the impression that, if allowed to go on, the individual will do the college work. The experiment is tried and the result is satisfactory. I venture to say that every college has in every class more than one illustration of the fact that a very imperfectly prepared student is really well qualified to do college work, depending very largely upon the character of the individual and his mode of work, and the determination with which he sets about it. All this is lost sight of, of course, in any such system as this.

A third point that strikes me is that, however this question of definition to which the chairman of the committee referred is viewed, the plan proposed practically takes away from every college the opportunity of really defining its requirements. You may say what you please, as it seems to me, about the college defining the meaning of its entrance requirements. The real definition is given in the examination paper, unless there is a subsequent contact to modify that definition. When an examination paper is set before a series of students, and is sent out to schools before or after, then that examination paper will be the definition of what the college regards as its requirements for

entrance. I do not see, whether we take the Middle States' plan or the proposition that was made by the committee, that there is any practical difference between the two. It is a very serious question, as it seems to me, whether the colleges are ready to give up their individuality. That is one of the essential parts, as it seems to me, in their working power. It was very fully recognized in the report of the committee that the individuality of the colleges was something that needed to be kept. Now, if they all must march through one door—if they all must go abreast in determining their requirements for admission and in determining their methods of admission—they have practically, at the outset at least, lost that thing which heretofore has made them so serviceable in many ways. That statement, I recognize, perhaps, as fully as any, may be susceptible of various interpretations; that is, it might be regarded by some as meaning that some colleges want the opportunity to take in persons who are imperfectly fitted, whom other colleges would throw out entirely. I do not mean it in that sense. It may be so in some cases, but I do not intend that that should be the meaning of the phrase. Therefore it seems to me that, putting aside any such interpretation as that, it is a serious objection to such a plan as this that it substitutes a machine for the operation of an individual. I suppose it is true that as boys and girls come in increasing numbers to the colleges there must be a greater distance and a more machine-like exactness in receiving them; but, admitting the truth of that, it seems to me that it is exceedingly desirable that, as far as possible, the examining board of the college should have a touch with the students and with the schools that shall get at the real life and the real character of the individual (applause).

DR. WILLIAM C. COLLAR, of the Roxbury Latin School.—*Ladies and Gentlemen of the Association:* This association was formed about sixteen years ago for the purpose of bringing about, as far as practicable, uniformity in the requirements for admission to college. I have been present at every meeting but one, and I think I can say with perfect assurance that no question more interesting or more important has ever been brought



before this association than the one that we are discussing this afternoon. The association, I think everybody will say who is a member and who knows what its work has been, has done an admirable work. I think it has accomplished in these sixteen years more than those of us who were present at the founding of the association dared to hope. I believe the question before us today is substantially whether that work is to receive its consummation and crowning now or whether that desirable end is to be deferred still for many years.

In a general way I heartily approve of the recommendations of the committee who have made their report. I should like to glance very briefly at some of the objections stated at the beginning of their report, at some of the reasons that the committee urge in favor of the adoption of their report, and at certain defects, as it seems to me, in the scheme that they offer, and also to inquire a little as to the applicability of the scheme to all colleges, whether there is any essential limitation in the nature of things or not. And first, with regard to the objections that the committee have stated. I do not propose to rehearse them at length, but merely to glance at them.

The first one is one referred to by Professor Lord, and is stated on the margin of page 4 of the report, "Objection to the elimination of the personal element," and what is meant by the personal element has already been illustrated, I think, in part, by Professor Lord's remarks. It is easy to see by a glance what this committee had in mind. It says :

It has been pointed out by those who take this view that, even though the preparation of suitable papers be comparatively easy, the determination of the way in which the applicant has met the requirements of the papers is not only not easy, but involves as well some attention to the personality of the applicant himself. Cases are frequent in which the mere written results of an examination, as shown in the answers to questions, are not after all a sufficient indication either of the attainments of the candidate or of his fitness to do college work ; and a wholly impersonal treatment of the matter, in which not only the examiner and the candidate are unknown to each other, but in which the college of the candidate's choice may not appear directly at all, is felt by many to hold more of disadvantage than of gain. Consideration must sometimes be given to the particular circumstances of the

candidate's preparation, and even to his physical condition at the time the examination is taken.

And so on. That, I say, was partially covered by Professor Lord's remarks, but is there really anything in it? Professor Lord himself indicated, in referring to President Hadley, that this matter of personal contact is a thing of the past. I supposed it was absolutely and completely a thing of the past. I suppose, and I still believe, that where examinations are held at colleges they are held by presenting to the candidate papers to which he is to write out the answers, passages of which he is to write out the translation, problems which he is to solve. These papers are then gathered and read by examiners, marked, weighed, and the candidate is informed, by letter commonly, whether he is received or not. I should like to know where the personal element comes in. The personal element did come in once. I remember when I was examined for college I was examined orally. But I say I believe that thing is a thing of the past, and therefore that that objection falls to the ground, that the proper answer to the objection that the personal element is eliminated is that there is not any personal element to eliminate.

The next point is on page 5. The committee say in the margin, "Objection to the surrender of control." Professor Lord has referred to that, but it is true that in the main the committee show by their recommendations that the colleges do not surrender control. If the report of the committee prevails, the colleges are to determine for themselves whether candidates pass a sufficiently satisfactory examination or not. To be sure, the separate colleges give up the preparation of separate papers, they commit that to a body of experts; but that is the only respect in which they give up direct control. That objection, then, falls to the ground.

The next one is on page 8, "Objection to the obliteration of college individuality." I wish I had time to read the essential points under that. I will read only two or three sentences.

Behind every college and university in New England, and constituting no small measure of its claim to support are its history, its traditions, its

customs, its distinctive points of view, its characteristic methods, its standards and ideals. These things make up the college spirit, the college atmosphere; they give the college tone.

And so on, and so on. That objection could never have been urged except from a dismal confusion of ideas. In saying that I do not reflect on the committee, for it is understood that these objections are not the objections of the committee, but they are the objections that are current. How is it a confusion of ideas? Undoubtedly there is such a thing as a college spirit, a college tone. Undoubtedly there are distinct college associations. But is anybody to suppose that all the subtle and manifold associations and influences of college life descend upon the happy candidate who appears at Amherst, or Dartmouth, or Harvard, the moment he gets there, and permeate him and envelop him and abide with him until the examination is over? Does anybody suppose any such thing? Not at all. He has set before him a set of papers, and his business is to write out the answers to the papers. Then he leaves, and that is the whole of it. I think we should fitly denominate that as pure moonshine.

Those are all the objections that are stated, and the last one that I read is the final one, and therefore probably the weightiest of them all. For my own part, I can conceive in sober truth nothing more fanciful, more unsubstantial, more utterly without foundation.

The committee proceeded to consider the advantages, and those advantages are stated on page 10 in a sentence:

.... and coöperation which aims to remove obvious friction, and to bring about desirable results with greater economy of time, labor, money, and mental wear and tear.

Those are the things the committee says, "coöperation which aims to remove obvious friction, and to bring about desirable results with greater economy of time, labor, money, and mental wear and tear." And then, again, on page 13, at the top, the benefits are summed up:

We are accordingly led to conclude that the joint conduct of entrance examinations, so far as the mere administrative features are concerned, would, if a suitable system could be devised, result in great relief to the

teachers of preparatory schools, and in an appreciable saving of labor and expense to the colleges, while both classes of institutions would share in the undoubted benefits of a nearer approach to a uniform interpretation of the requirements as laid down in the catalogues.

Those are the advantages that the committee sum up. They say on page 12 that "the present system" is "burdensome to the private fitting school," and below, page 12, "the present system" is "still more burdensome to the public high school."

We have covered the ground of the objections and of the advantages, so far as the committees report is concerned, but, in my humble opinion, ladies and gentlemen, the committee has not made half so strong a case as it might have made. I believe that there are great advantages that will certainly accrue that are not glanced at, and one of them is this: I believe that a central examination board would draw up questions and papers with better judgment and with far greater care than they are now drawn.

What is the present system? Each college sets its own examination papers. Nobody knows—the candidate, the public—nobody knows who the individuals are that set these papers. The department is represented in the Greek paper, in the Latin paper, and so on through the rest, but what man sets the paper we never know. Therefore no responsibility can be brought to bear or can be weightily felt by the person who prepares the paper. I will not go into specifications unless I am challenged, but I am sorry to say that the papers do sometimes show lack of judgment, and very often lack of careful editing. I have found it, in fact, in my experience very necessary, before I set a paper to a class in Latin, that is, a college paper that has been used to the class in Latin, or the class in Greek, to read through that paper most carefully, for one day I found myself stuck on a passage that I was about to set them, and I could not see what the matter was with it until I looked it up in some edition and found the punctuation was wrong. I had been entirely misled. Examples of misprints are not uncommon. I have been told by teachers in science that occasionally a question is asked in science that cannot be answered, and I think

Mr. Bradbury has told me of instances in algebra where a problem could not be fairly worked out to a satisfactory result. These are trifles, to be sure, but it is not a trifle whether the paper is set with good judgment, with discrimination, or not.

Moreover, I have always contended that there is great educative value in the papers that the colleges set. Those papers are carefully scanned by every teacher who is preparing boys and girls. It is, as Professor Lord said, the interpretation properly of the paper requirements. We don't know exactly what the paper requirements in the catalogue really mean until we see the actual papers.

Then I believe that there would result a material advantage, because I think that such an examination board would be a powerfully influential factor, and would be able to get the colleges now and then to step out of the beaten track in their requirements, and not oblige us men of the preparatory schools forever to tread the same round of authors and of work. It would be a positive boon to a great many teachers to be expected and to be required sometimes to prepare a class for a thorough examination in some work that they have not been accustomed to read, and let that continue for a number of years, as, for instance, the *De Senectute*, which is easier, to my mind very much easier, than the orations of Cicero, which are now made the subject of a thoroughgoing examination. Can anybody doubt that if this were done the schools would be materially benefited, in that the teachers would pass out of the beaten track and study Latin that they had been less familiar with? It was the firm conviction in my mind that this could and might be done in time that led me years ago to join with Dr. Tetlow in the preparation of a series of school classics, so that if any teacher desires he might have at hand a little volume that would meet just his needs, but we found no encouragement. I may say that the series, while I was one of the editors, fell pretty nearly flat. I had to withdraw, but Dr. Tetlow, like the heroic and invincible man that he is, kept on and keeps on, hopeless, no doubt, but not dismayed (applause).

But there is a very much weightier consideration in my mind

than what I have advanced, and that is I thoroughly believe that the adoption of the recommendation of this report by this association would slay the certificate system. I believe it would be the death of the certificate system, and I long to see that done (applause). I have always believed that the certificate system worked injuriously on the scholarship of the preparatory schools. I believe that it is in accordance with human nature to believe that by the certificate system a most important stimulus is withdrawn from learners and from teachers to thoroughness, to scholarship, to strenuous effort. I believe, notwithstanding what Professor Lord said a little while ago, that there is in the minds of college faculties who have adopted wholly or in part the certificate system, a grave doubt of its being really an excellent thing itself. The committee who make the report state, perhaps wrongly, that that system is making no headway and they believe that the colleges would, generally speaking, be glad to give it up. I don't know that all of them would, but I believe that many would, and I think if it were given up, if every teacher knew that his boys and girls had to face an examination, it could not be otherwise than that his efforts would be increased, and those of the pupils too. But there is another evil of the certificate system, and that is that it increases the differences in actual requirements. I mean to say that there may be two institutions having in their catalogue very nearly the same requirements, while it appears by the details that they require in their certificates that their requirements are really essentially very different. I think I heard Mr. Bradbury say once, in a meeting of this association, that it was a work of about two hours to make out one certificate for Wellesley College. I have made out certificates sometimes for boys for Dartmouth College, and I think perhaps it took me half an hour. Now, that difference between the half an hour spent in making out a certificate and the two hours will give you possibly some little intimation of the difference in the amount of detail, at least, though it does not show all the essential differences that exist in those requirements of certificates.

I said I saw, I thought, a defect or two in the report of the

committee. I seem to see one or two grave defects. The chairman read you the differences between the plans that his committee proposed and the plan of the Maryland and Middle States Association. He stated that there were finally three differences. I find a fourth difference that he said nothing about which is more important than all his three. The chairman must be presumed to know his own report, but on page 21, near the bottom, the fifth paragraph, it says :

That not later than December of each academic year, the board designate, for each subject in which it is proposed to hold an examination, a college teacher to act as chief examiner, and two additional college teachers to act as associate examiners.

That is to say, his board, or their board, consists of three examiners. These are all to be specialists. They are college men and experts in their departments. But in the Middle States scheme on each one of the groups of three, each of the nine groups, there is a schoolmaster. It seems to me that that offers really a great advantage. I should not want to be the schoolmaster to be on the committee, but there they have nine schoolmasters on their nine groups. A schoolmaster is a man who knows a little of several things, generally, and the college professor is a man who knows a great deal of one subject. It seems to me that a schoolmaster may very well supplement the knowledge and the experience of a college professor, and therefore I think it is a defect of this report that it entirely excludes representatives of preparatory schools. The committee say, apropos of that, something that is really interesting. Pages 16 and 17, at the bottom of 16 and near the top of 17 :

No one, of course, would think of questioning either the fairness or the integrity of any representative of a secondary school who might hold a place on such a committee ; but the situation created by such membership seems to your committee wholly anomalous.

and so on. Then, on the next page :

To ask any teacher of a secondary school to assist in preparing an examination paper, and at the same time so perfectly to treasure the secret of its contents during the months between its preparation and use as never to be in the slightest degree influenced by his knowledge of it in his own treatment of his classes is, your committee think, to ask the impossible.

Yet the Middle States Association have found it possible, apparently. They have nine schoolmasters on their groups of examiners. The chairman says, or the committee says, that, of course, their fairness and their integrity is not to be questioned, but it *is* questioned on the next page. It is to ask, he says, of them a thing that is impossible. That is to say, human nature, and especially the nature of a schoolmaster, is not of a sufficiently strenuous virtue to withstand such an awful temptation as this. I must say that that seems to me an unwarranted reproach cast upon the schoolmaster. It seems to me that I know of several schoolmasters who would actually be capable of resisting the temptation to be false to their trust. Why, what trust we put in our judges, what confidence we bestow on them. How often it happens that a judge in the court is to decide a case, for instance, relative to a patent, and knowing beforehand what his decision is he might make his fortune in a day. He knows that his decision is going to boom or depress the market in regard to that particular thing. But the thing, so far as I know, has never been surmised. Never has anybody suspected it of any judge. Think of what Secretary Gage might do in handling the finances of this government. He knows what he is going to do a month in advance. He keeps his secret. I never heard that the Chancellor of the Exchequer in England was charged with making money in any such underhand way; that is to say, he is trusted, and he is true to his trust. I believe that there are schoolmasters that can be trusted. Mr. Bradbury said—I beg his pardon for mentioning him so often, but he is himself at fault—Mr. Bradbury said in a meeting of this association with reference to this point that he should not like to see me on such an examining board (laughter). Well, I don't want to be. I think if I were chosen I should resign. But I should be very glad to see Mr. Bradbury on such a board, and I have perfect confidence that Mr. Bradbury actually would not work out the problems in algebra and geometry with his class in advance because he knew what was coming.

Now, to pass that point and come to the last point, whether this scheme is entirely applicable, or whether there is any



necessary limitation, I believe that Harvard College could not come into the fold, and I don't know that personally I should want to see it. Whether I should or not is not the question. The Harvard entrance examination is currently considered, and I believe with truth, to be harder than the examinations of the other colleges. I think it is currently believed that the requirements for Harvard are pretty nearly a year in advance of the requirements of most other New England colleges. If you compared the requirements, for instance, in Latin of the colleges that are nearest to Harvard, Tufts and Boston University, I think you would say that on paper there was all of a year's difference. I have lately been through all the catalogues of all the New England colleges and compared their requirements, and the impression, total impression, made upon my mind is that the requirements at Harvard are in the main considerably above the requirements of other colleges. There are two or three colleges, perhaps three, that have pretty nearly the same requirements on paper that Harvard has, but in general it is not so. I believe, then, that the difference in the severity of the examination in the requirements for the entrance at Harvard would be an insurmountable barrier to Harvard's coming into this arrangement. But I think there is a barrier even greater still that is quite insurmountable, and that is that Harvard's examination is of a different sort from the examination of other colleges, speaking grossly. Speaking generally, Harvard tests the power of the candidate and the other colleges test the acquisitions of the candidate. I agree that these cannot be entirely and sharply distinguished, but that is a distinction that prevails sufficiently to be stated in that way. Harvard accordingly, in all languages, sets passages supposed to be unseen previously; the other colleges generally set passages supposed to have been seen. Even Yale limits its sight examinations to Caesar, Nepos, and Ovid. Another college I recall limits them to Ovid and Nepos. Several do put down, in fact, a large number of them do put down, reading at sight as one of the tests, but I have every reason to suppose that that test is altogether a subordinate one, while in Harvard, in the languages, it is the only test. Here is a

difference that I do not think can be got round, and I think it would not be altogether deplored by anybody if it should be found that the other colleges could unite—how it would be about Yale I cannot tell—if the other colleges could unite and Harvard should not join. I believe that the setting of a higher standard, as Harvard does and will doubtless continue to do, would, on the whole, tend to raise the standard that a board of examiners would fix for the other colleges (applause).

PROFESSOR EDWIN H. HALL, of Harvard University.—*Mr. President and Members of the Association:* I wish to say a few words in regard to a criticism which was made by Mr. Collar of the plan as proposed by the committee. The point is whether there should be representatives of schools on the boards or committees making out the questions. I think Mr. Collar has misunderstood the main objection, or one of the main objections, to that feature. He has apparently assumed that the committee, in saying that it was impossible that a man should be uninfluenced by his knowledge of what was to be on the paper, meant to say that he would make illegitimate use of his knowledge for the advantage of his pupils. I think what was more in the minds of the committee was that he would be hampered, he would be embarrassed, he would hesitate to give to his pupils the instruction they ought to have, for fear he would be making an undue use of what was on the examination paper. That is the embarrassment, that is the main difficulty, I think. That is the reason, I think, why Mr. Bradbury said he did not want to be and would not be on the committee. I believe it is the reason Mr. Collar does not want to be on the committee. It is the reason why most people would not wish to be on that committee.

Mr. Collar has said that this experiment is tried, and tried successfully, by the Middle States' plan. Well, there are six letters in the last part of this report of Professor Butler, letters from the school men who helped make out the questions. I find enough in those letters to condemn that feature of the Middle States' plan which has those men in the making out of the papers. The first three of those letters are, I think, unqualified in their support of the coöperation of the school men in making out the

questions, but let me read you two sentences from the fourth letter, from Mr. Frank Rollins, known to many of you :

My part in framing and revising questions for the examination in physics did not embarrass us in our work of instruction,—

Now, why ?

. . . as another teacher had the college preparatory class.

So much for Mr. Rollins. Now for Mr. Thomas B. Bronson, the writer of the next letter :

I had not thought of any embarrassment regarding the point in question. Of course, a dishonest teacher might give his class information that would help his pupils under him, and perhaps an honest teacher would think it his duty to instruct especially on points that would be brought out in the paper.

That's enough, I think. A dishonest teacher would make use of it, and an honest teacher might. What others are there ? And the next letter is from a man who, although he sneers at all objections, thinks that on the whole the teachers had better not participate.

Mr. President and gentlemen, I think that the proper way for the schools to have influence in this is that the questions should be set by college men, that then, after the papers for the summer are set, read, marked, those college men should come before an assembly like this and hear any criticism which may be made on their work, should appear here personally. That is the way to get the influence, not of one teacher, but of all teachers, on the work. It is assumed that the one teacher who will make out the questions, or help make them out, will represent all the schools. Is that a fair assumption ? Fads and hobbies are just as common among teachers of schools as amongst teachers in colleges. There is no assurance whatever that the one teacher picked out to help make examinations would set questions which would please his fellow teachers. I say let the college men take the responsibility and let them then bear that responsibility before such a meeting as this.

MR. GEORGE L. FOX, of New Haven.—*Mr. Chairman:* The question seems to resolve itself into two main questions : (1) Do we need in New England an elaborate examination board, such as is already established in the Middle States and Maryland ?

(2) Granted that we do, shall we adopt this excellent scheme proposed, with many faults—excellent, I say—or shall we improve on it as we think?

I cannot see the slightest reason for this examination board in New England—not the slightest reason. I never heard it broached until a year ago, and it seems to me the motive for it is a desire not to be left behind the band wagon, to keep up with the procession. Mr. Collar let the whole thing right out when he said he did not suppose that Harvard would go into this thing. He could not speak for Yale, nor can I, but I judge from the past that if Harvard doesn't go in Yale won't go in, and there ends the matter. There is not a small college in New England that is not very ready to take pupils on a fair average examination, and not stickling at that either. That is what they want. That is the good work that they are doing, to take men who may not measure up along the other standards, and it is a noble work too. But are there many schools that are troubled by the very stiff requirements of the small college in their examinations, so that they think they will be helped out of their difficulties by the formation of an elaborate examination board? I don't believe there are. The schools that I have heard of most as desiring uniformity, first of requirements, and then possibly of the examination, are the two great schools of Phillips Exeter and Phillips Andover, which prepare for a large number of colleges. I don't believe there are many schools in Connecticut that are suffering from this matter. Most of the schools in Connecticut prepare for Yale. I should say unquestionably 75 per cent. of the schools in Connecticut prepare for Yale. I suppose that at least 75 per cent. of the students at Phillips Exeter and Phillips Andover prepare for Yale and Harvard, and if these colleges are not coming into the board, but are going to carry on their examinations, all the troubles, the so-called or imagined troubles, of the secondary school remain just the same. They have got to face two examinations, the examination board and the examinations of Yale and Harvard, and that will be a great trouble. So I cannot find, and I am talking to you honestly, any crying demand for this extra machinery.

Now from the point of view of the college. I am not a champion of the colleges at all, but it is nonsense to me to say that it is going to relieve the college of a great deal of trouble. If you put all your difficulties on this examination board, the members of that board are going to work a good deal harder than at their colleges, because they have a larger number of persons to attend to. In the second place, every college that I know anything about, certainly Yale and Harvard, carries on a September examination as well as a June examination. What are you going to do about that? A very small percentage of the boys, practically not more than 33 per cent., get in in June; and the September examination is of just as much importance as the June examination, because it is final. Those September papers at Yale, I know, are made out at the same time that the June papers are made out. All the difficulty the June examination makes for the man who makes out the examination paper is that he has two papers to make out instead of one. It is not a very great difficulty, when he is at it. Unquestionably, unless every college does as Columbia does, turns over the whole of its examination to this board, you are still going to have two examinations. So from the point of view of relieving the colleges, it strikes me that this plan is something like moonshine.

I want to touch upon another point that Mr. Collar touched upon. "We shall have responsibility," he says. "We don't know now who makes out a given paper, but we shall know then. We can hold him responsible." Well that, it seems to me, won't bear examination very closely with a microscope. You know, I presume, that the examination paper in Latin in Yale or Harvard is made out by one of three men; you know that the examination paper in Greek is made out by one of three men, and you have the responsibility distributed among three in this examination board also. So that question of responsibility, it seems to me, does not bear any examination at all. Practically there is not much difference of responsibility between the old method and this method, in my opinion.

Now I wish to take up another point which Mr. Collar brought up. It is an old question, on which we have locked

horns more than once at New Haven before, this wider variety of subjects which the preparatory school teacher can teach if this thing goes into operation. I don't believe you can find a university or a college in New England or anywhere else, if it is given sufficient notice, that will not be willing to prepare a paper on any subject that you will name, if you want to teach that. For instance, last year I took up certain books of the Odyssey, which I had not taught. I simply sent in word that I wanted these boys examined on the Odyssey, and the paper came out all right. I don't find the college professors of any college anxious to hold you down, if you don't want to be held down. The trouble with regard to the narrowness of requirements in Latin and Greek is that, considering the brief time that students study Latin and Greek before examination, the scope of examination is very much limited, and it must necessarily be. Some subjects that have been proposed as substitutes, as Eutropius, are simply nonsense, in my opinion. In England, where you have boys studying five or six years, you can widen the scope considerably, but you cannot in America. But I may say that if we have to establish this great examination board in order to get a wider range of subjects for secondary school teachers, in my opinion, that is very much like moonshine ; for I say from practical experience that at Yale, and I don't believe it is different at any other college, you can get an examination on any subject that you want, if there are a sufficient number of students to warrant the examination and you give sufficient notice. And so we meet that argument for this examination board. It seems to me it is going a long way round to get what we already have.

Now I must pause for a digression, so to speak, because it was brought in by Mr. Collar. I don't know much about the Harvard examinations, but I do know that the examinations in Latin and Greek for Yale are distinctly as hard as the examinations in Latin and Greek for Harvard. The Latin unseen is in three different subjects, Cæsar, Nepos and Ovid, and in three years' time I have never hit the subject in my reading of those authors. You cannot in the time. And therefore every Yale boy knows that he has got to pass at least three or four fixed

examinations in Latin which he may be supposed to have seen and possibly three examinations in Latin at sight. Compare that with the single examination which is given in Latin by sight at Harvard, and I think we may say that the difficulty of the Latin and Greek examinations at Yale fairly evens up with the difficulty of the Latin and Greek examinations at Harvard.

I do agree very much with the report of the committee on one point, and that is with regard to the absence of secondary school teachers from making up the examination papers. Why, that goes without saying to any honest man. To Mr. Collar it goes without saying. He would not want to go on as an examiner; no man would. The point was made very properly by Professor Hall that these men would not make any effort, would not train their boys in the questions; of course not, but I defy any man of human nature not to be affected. He might try to stand up so straight that he would bend backward, but he would still be inclined. And as for the parallels that Mr. Collar quoted, why, he is not familiar with modern history. If there is any one thing that has been prominent, it is that Cæsar's wife must be above suspicion.

I don't believe we ought to have, I don't think there is any crying need at all for, this examination board. I believe that all the need there might have been for it was from the great schools that prepared for some of the smaller colleges and also for Harvard and Yale. If Harvard is not coming in—I don't know whether she is or not—if Yale is not coming in—I don't know whether she is or not—but, whether she is coming in or not, we don't need it. It is too much elaborate machinery.

I want to criticise one other statement of Mr. Collar. In his opening remarks he said that this is one of the most important questions that will ever come before this association; it is now to be decided whether we shall adopt this crowning work of this association or postpone it for many years. I question that last phrase. We need wait but one year here. It is within the province of any body who wants this to bring it up again. I will simply say that we had better be cautious. I am not saying anything against the Middle States' scheme; I hope it will

go on. It is an experiment, and they are working it out. For twenty-five years it has worked well in England, as anybody who knows the Oxford and Cambridge certificate examination knows, but they apply it more rigidly than we do here. We need not however, be in a hurry to try this plan. The trouble with this scheme is that we are proposing to adopt something entirely new in this country, which has had but one trial. Emerson in one of his essays somewhere, I think it is the essay called "Compromise," speaks of the great heartiness and admiration which a charming young girl showed in her words in regard to the new minister, after he had preached a first Sunday. He was the most dear, delightful preacher she ever heard. Emerson said, "I like your opinion now, but I should like it better two years from now."

[It is a matter of regret, which I am sure our readers share, that even with the additional pages of this month we are unable to insert the remainder of the interesting discussion on this important topic. The full report will be found in the *Proceedings of the New England Association*, published by that association. The other speakers were: Professor Charles P. Parker, of Harvard University; President L. Clark Seelye, of Smith College; President E. G. Coy; Mr. Charles S. Knox, of St. Paul's School; Professor Morris, of Yale University; Dr. William E. Waters, Associate Secretary of the College Entrance Examination Board of the Middle States and Maryland; Principal Charles C. Ramsay, of Fall River High School; President Warren, of Boston University; Principal Collar, of Roxbury Latin School; Dr. Frank A. Hill; Professor Tyler, of the Institute of Technology; President Raymond, of Wesleyan University.—GEO. H. LOCKE.]